

- S. 323. An act for the relief of E. C. Beaver, who suffered loss on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917;
- S. 342. An act for the relief of L. L. Stokes;
- S. 470. An act for the relief of Alice Minnick;
- S. 532. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey, widow of William R. Ramsey, Jr., late special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice;
- S. 760. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guy A. McConoha;
- S. 766. An act for the relief of the Missoula Brewing Co.;
- S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the special joint congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; and
- S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Will Rogers.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the lumber tariff and our foreign trade, and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a very short editorial from the Rome News-Tribune, one of the leading papers of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

## COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday and Wednesday the Committee on Accounts may be permitted to sit during sessions of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume this is agreeable to the ranking Republican member?

Mr. WARREN. I have not had an opportunity to talk with the ranking Republican member, but if it is not agreeable, we, of course, will not sit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Monday after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 26 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 26

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Propaganda and Activities is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1941, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8, strike out "1941" and insert "1940."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, at this time against the resolution by virtue of the fact that according to Hinds' Precedents, 4403, when a select committee reports in full on the subject committed, it is thereby dissolved, but it may be revived by a vote.

There is one other way that the committee may be revived and that is if any new material had been referred to the committee previous to the time the committee was dissolved.

This committee was dissolved on January 3, 1939, and this resolution provides for a continuance of the committee. You cannot continue that which does not exist, and therefore the only way that this resolution could be considered would be by a direct vote on a revival of the committee and then an authorization for its continuance.

I therefore submit the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COX. The precedents of the House settle the point of order that has been raised. The pending resolution in form is the same as those heretofore employed in continuing committees that had expired by reason of the limitation as to time fixed in resolutions bringing them into being.

The meaning of this resolution is that the same committee heretofore functioning under the original resolution is revived with power in the Speaker, of course, to fill any vacancies that may exist.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman recognizes the fact that no point of order was raised against the resolution that we reported a couple of days ago on the matter of reorganization of the Government.

Mr. COX. The question was brought up and discussed and was met by an amendment that was offered. However, there is a long series of precedents upon identically the same point as the one that has been raised here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan raises the point of order against the resolution on the grounds that the functions and authority conferred upon the select committee by the Seventy-fifth Congress have expired and therefore that the Rules Committee has no authority to report a resolution reviving and continuing the activities of that committee.

The Committee on Rules, of course, is a highly privileged committee. Under the rules of the House it has authority to report on matters of this character. As the Chair understands the resolution, reading the letter and the spirit of it, it provides not only for the continuance of the select committee appointed by virtue of the resolution of the Seventy-fifth Congress, but also for a revival of said committee. In other words, in the opinion of the Chair, the Committee on Rules had the authority, under the rules of the House, to breathe life into this select committee if they saw fit to do so and the resolution was approved by the House.

This is not a new matter. The Chair has not before it immediately the precedents, but in the Seventy-fourth Congress and in the Seventy-fifth Congress similar resolutions were presented. It has been held that the Committee on Rules has the power and jurisdiction to report resolutions similar in character and substance to this. As a matter of fact, the precedent cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], section 4403, Hinds' Precedents, sustains the position which the Chair feels impelled to take. The Chair will re-read that:

When a select committee reports in full on the subject committed, it is thereby dissolved; but it may be revived by a vote.

As the Chair understands it, the purpose and object of this resolution is to revive this committee by a vote in the House. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the time in my control I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], to be in turn yielded by him as he desires.



Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I want to explain to the House that I have asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] to report this resolution. I am so vigorously opposed to the resolution that I cannot in good conscience report it myself. There are a number of other Members who have had no opportunity to be heard on this matter, who strongly desire to be heard, and I ask whether the gentleman who is in charge of the resolution will not agree to at least 1 hour for each side in order that all arguments can be brought before the House?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to make any agreement that would bind the House, but if any gentleman wishes to propound a unanimous-consent request, that would be a matter to be considered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for consideration of the resolution be extended by 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between those for and those against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. And that the previous question shall be considered as ordered at the end of the 2 hours?

Mr. SABATH. Correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time for debate upon the pending resolution may be extended 1 hour, so that there may be 2 hours of debate on the resolution, one-half of which shall be controlled by those in favor of the resolution and the remainder by those in opposition to the resolution, and that at the conclusion of the 2 hours of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have no objection to the extension of time. I think the control of the time, however, should be as usual, in charge of the majority side by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who has control of the resolution, and the minority member on this side, to dispose of as we see fit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to an equal division of the time as between those for and those against.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only submit the unanimous-consent request in the terms in which it is offered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, though I shall not do so. If the unanimous consent is granted, will that mean that the resolution is open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish to propose an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. COX. I regret that I shall not be in the position to yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman would read the amendment, I think that he would agree to it.

Mr. COX. I have read the amendment, and there is much in it that would be considered by the committee if it is revived.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does not the gentleman permit me to offer this amendment to the resolution?

Mr. COX. I am sorry, but I cannot yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. In view of the fact that this matter has been under consideration for some time and that every Member of the House has made up his mind how he is going to vote, and that speech making would not change a single vote, I feel constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish anyone to feel that he has been denied the opportunity to express his views on the resolution. May not the gentleman from Illinois submit a request to extend the time for 1 hour? If the time is under my control I shall take pleasure in dividing it equally as between those for and those against.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a motion. The Chair will entertain a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request and agree to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] in respect to the control of the time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLER. Do I understand that this resolution as proposed before this House this morning is not subject to amendment?

Mr. COX. Except upon motion of the committee. The committee will offer the amendment disclosed in the report, unless the previous question is voted down.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield with pleasure.

Mrs. NORTON. I would like to get some information about this.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that this is not coming out of the time allowed the gentleman from Georgia?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the time is running.

Mr. COX. I will yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, in any event.

Mrs. NORTON. My understanding is that this resolution cannot be amended. The only way it can be amended is to vote down the previous question. Then it will be subject to amendment. Am I right?

Mr. COX. That is correct, except as to amendments which the committee will offer.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that the time be extended?

The SPEAKER. It would not be in order. The Chair cannot entertain a motion to extend the time, under the rules of the House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time that has expired?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to be used by him as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to revive and continue the committee commonly known as the Dies committee, set up to investigate un-American activities. Your Committee on Rules held hearings, extending over 2 or 3 days, hearing every Member of the House who expressed a desire to be heard. A great many appeared and were given full latitude in setting forth their views. The committee came to the conclusion that the work which this investigating committee was set up to do had not been completed, that it was an important work, and that the investigation should be continued.

I do not believe there was a single witness—or, if one, not more than one or two—who opposed the continuation of the investigation. Those protesting the adoption of the resolution put their objections upon the ground that they were dissatisfied with the personnel of the committee as heretofore existing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, while I am not here to insist that the committee exercised complete caution in the conduct of its investigation, yet at the same time I am not prepared to concede that the committee is subject to any of the criticism that has been directed against it. I think the committee has been very grossly misrepresented and has been unjustly criticized.

Those objecting have taken the position that the committee has not sat as a purely judicial body, and that they have not observed the strict rules of evidence in receiving testimony. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the committee is not expected to function as a strictly judicial body, nor is it expected to rigidly observe rules of evidence in the taking of testimony. The chief criticism directed against the committee is that it has permitted people with grievances to appear before the committee and to take advantage of that



appearance to direct unfair charges against people throughout the country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that has been done, but I do not consider that the committee is chargeable with the duty of verifying the truthfulness of what is to be said before a witness testifies. The committee, I believe, has endeavored to be fair. Certainly, in the light of the criticism that has been made and the experience had, the committee, if recreated and permitted to continue the investigation, will avoid repetition of any mistakes and will escape the criticism that has heretofore been leveled against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in view of the limited time that is allowed for debate, and due to the further fact there are many who would like to register their views on this resolution, I have requested very little time to discuss it myself.

It seems to me that the type and character of the opposition to the Dies committee is perhaps the strongest argument and recommendation for its continuation. I realize there are a great many well-intentioned people who have been misled by false and sinister propaganda, who perhaps feel that this committee has abused some of its prerogatives, but the bulk of the opposition that has been registered against this committee comes from well-known and well-recognized un-American activities throughout this country. From the very outset it has been apparent that an insidious conspiracy was afoot to discredit this committee. In the first instance, they attempted to ridicule it out of existence. Then they resorted to laughter, and finally when they could not win their objective by those methods, they proceeded to smear the committee by abuse, misrepresentation, and billingsgate.

Now, this has not been confined alone to the un-American organizations of this country. Some of the outstanding executive figures of this administration have condescended to resort to tactics in this respect which seem to me beneath the dignity of such figures, attempting to bring this committee into disrepute.

So far as I know, this is the first instance where a special committee of the Congress has been assailed and assaulted by an official of the executive department of the Government. To me this is a very sad and melancholy commentary, and as a rebuke to this reprehensible spectacle this resolution ought to be adopted by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time within the past few days that resolutions have been brought here to extend special committees, and in both of the other instances this House has adopted those resolutions without a dissent. So, Mr. Speaker, why all this hub-bub and commotion and opposition to the Dies committee? Of course, you all know the answer. The answer is that this investigation has "got under the skin" of those subversive influences and their sympathizers who would sabotage the hallowed institutions of our Government and erect on their ruins a system of government of a foreign pattern. After all, Mr. Speaker, the only difference between ultra-liberalism and communism is one of degree. If you will visit the offices of the Rules Committee and see the avalanche of telegrams, letters, and post cards that were sent this committee by so-called liberals protesting this resolution, you will have some conception and appreciation of the apprehension which the advocates and sympathizers of these un-American philosophies entertain if this committee is continued. The verity of the old adage that it is always the "hit dog that howls" has been abundantly demonstrated by the bitter fight that has been waged against this resolution. For 3 days so-called liberals of the House used the Rules Committee as a sounding board for their lurid protestations. They clearly showed by their testimony that it was the scalp of MARTIN DIES that they sought, and that nothing short of that would satisfy them.

The methods employed by these radical agents and organizations to discredit the so-called Dies committee has in some instances been both pitiful and ludicrous. For in-

stance, they put out the perfectly amusing story that the committee had charged Shirley Temple with being a Communist. That, of course, was nonsensical to the point of absurdity. Recently, in a further attempt to discredit the committee, they claimed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was trying to elect himself President of the United States and wanted to use this \$100,000 or \$150,000 to advance his candidacy. Of course, I do not know just what ambitions the distinguished gentleman from Texas may entertain, but so far as that is concerned, I think MARTIN DIES would make a better President than some I have seen since I came to Washington 20 years ago—and I do not have in mind Herbert Hoover when I say that. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I myself have had some experience on special committees to investigate un-American activities. I had the honor of serving with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities during the Seventy-third Congress, and I know something of the difficulties and embarrassments which confront committees to investigate these subversive influences. An attempt was made to lambast us and lampoon us, but not to the extent that we witnessed with the Dies committee, because there has been no limit to the abuse and vituperation that has been heaped upon this committee. In my judgment, it has been wholly unjustified. [Applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that to vote down this resolution can only mean a repudiation of this able and courageous committee. It will be hailed with a great hallelujah by every "red" organization in this country, together with their adherents and sympathizers. So far as I am concerned, I refuse to give them this comfort and consolation. I refuse to believe that this House with its proud and illustrious traditions will consent to "run out" on a committee of its own creation—a committee which it is now proposed to crucify because it showed courage and determination in its efforts to expose radicalism in our midst. [Applause.]

(Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that he ask unanimous consent that those who speak have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there is evident a desire on the part of the Members to express themselves, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as has been previously stated, this is a resolution to continue for 1 year the special committee, commonly known as the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. You will remember 1 year ago the great majority of the Members of this House were of the opinion that there were too much un-American activities in this country. We were of the opinion that something should be done. Accordingly, a resolution similar to the one before us was presented. In compliance with it Speaker BANKHEAD named this special committee which was composed of five Democratic Members and two Republican Members. In the selection of this committee Speaker BANKHEAD was very careful and particular. For chairman he selected an outstanding and lifelong Democrat from Texas, Mr. DIES, a Member who has served with distinction in this body for 8 years, an individual that has the respect of every Member of Congress, by reason of his fearlessness, honesty, and ability. Mr. HEALY, of Massachusetts; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; and Mr. STARNES, of Alabama, present Members of this House, were also



appointed by the Speaker to this committee. There is one vacancy. All of these Members are outstanding Members. They have served the Democratic Party with distinction for many years. They are not new Members of this body. The Speaker, in selecting them, knew them well. Mr. BANKHEAD selected them because he knew they were fearless, because he knew them to be honest, because he knew they would use every honest effort to lessen the un-American activities in this country. Speaker BANKHEAD is no novice in the art of selecting committees. He has performed that duty before, and we all admit that he has always done a very good job. What I have stated about the Democratic Members applies equally to the two Republicans on this committee.

My reason in discussing the membership of this committee is this: For the past 3 days certain Members of Congress have come before the Rules Committee attacking the sincerity and the honesty and integrity of the membership of this special committee. Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York; Mr. VOORHIS, of California; Mr. KELLER, of Illinois; and others, have come before the Rules Committee emphasizing that Mr. DIES, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, and others, did not possess the necessary sense of equality and sound judgment. They declared in no uncertain terms that these members of their own party did not have judicial minds and were intemperate in their actions. They stressed that Mr. DIES and others had been working for the benefit of the Republican Party and to the detriment of the Democratic Party and its various candidates. They harshly criticized every action of this committee. The hearings before the Rules Committee totaled approximately 7 hours. Opponents of this resolution were allotted approximately 6 hours of the 7 hours. Eight Members of Congress were heard against the resolution. Mr. DIES was the only one heard in favor of it. At the conclusion 13 out of the 14 members of the Rules Committee favored the passage of this resolution.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman mean to say we said that about the committee or about the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that implications were made in regard to all of the members of the committee.

Mr. KELLER. I deny the inference. I said that about the chairman, not about the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. All right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman think that what this committee is investigating now, namely, whether there is communism in this country and whether it is spreading is known to every man and woman throughout the United States without any investigation? Does not the gentleman believe that if this investigation is to be carried on, the causes of communism and its spread should be inquired into as well as the question of whether or not they exist?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think the committee are doing a good job.

I readily admit that this committee has not functioned 100 percent. What committee ever does? I personally did not agree with the La Follette committee when they confiscated private telegrams and correspondence. In my opinion, the few omissions of this committee can be attributed to lack of funds. Well do I remember a year ago, when this committee came before the Accounts Committee, of which I am a member, requesting \$100,000 to properly carry on its work. By reason that it was generally understood the various departments were to come to the aid of the Dies committee, giving clerical help and investigators, the committee was given \$25,000 instead of \$100,000. Then what happened? Mr. DIES wrote respectful letters to the various departments requesting help, but was refused this necessary aid. Even before the

committee had any hearings Cabinet members and others high in official life in Washington began an attack of vilification. Every effort was made to ridicule the work of the committee in the eyes of the public. Mr. DIES stood for these malicious attacks for several months and then, like the true he-man that he is, did a little "snipe" shooting himself. In other words, he took to the radio to justify the work of the committee and to defend it against these unjust and unwarranted assaults.

Much was said before the Rules Committee by Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York; Mr. VOORHIS, of California; Mr. KELLER, of Illinois, that the Dies committee worked for the benefit of the Republican candidates and to the detriment of the Democratic candidates for office during the 1938 elections. I interrogated Mr. DIES on that subject and he emphasized that nothing political entered the committee's work. Any contention that these five lifelong Democrats would be working for the Republican candidates for office is totally absurd. In support of its absurdity I would mention this: I hold here an article written by George E. Reedy, special Washington correspondent to the Philadelphia Inquirer. In the February 2, 1939, issue of that paper it states:

Speaker WILLIAM BANKHEAD (Democrat, Alabama) announced that if the investigation was continued the present Members would be reappointed.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, if you believe that Speaker BANKHEAD would want to reappoint the present committee if he believed it to be working for the benefit of Republican candidates for office and to the detriment of Democratic candidates?

This resolution should unanimously pass in order that those individuals and those organizations whose intentions are to overthrow our American system of government will know, and know well, that we in Washington will use every means to defeat their purposes; that we in Washington stand ready to fight to the last those who wish to assault our American principles and American institutions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now control only 13 minutes, and there are about 25 requests for time. Therefore, I will take just a few minutes myself in order to leave a minute here and there for other Members who wish to be heard against the resolution.

For 32 years it has been my contention that Members of this House should have the privilege given them in the Constitution of voting on bills and resolutions, rather than having legislation buried in committees. I have likewise always insisted that Members be given a fair and equal chance to state their position and express themselves on legislation before the House. That conviction has guided me in my consideration of the resolution now before us. Insisting that those in favor of it have the right to be heard, I reserve the right to speak against it.

I maintain that the special committee created by the original resolution, for which I voted in a firm belief that there should be a thorough investigation of un-American activities, has used the prestige of this Congress to become a medium for partisan attacks upon the Democratic administration, members of the Cabinet, organized labor, and many respected and outstanding citizens. The gentleman from Tennessee stated that the special committee had been smeared. If anyone was undeservedly smeared it was the thousands of loyal and patriotic American citizens who were given no slight opportunity to defend themselves before this committee. I have in my possession as chairman of the Committee on Rules thousands of telegrams and letters from preachers, teachers, organized labor leaders, civic leaders, public officials, veteran leaders, and others against whose organizations and themselves the most vicious insinuations have been made by unreliable and discredited investigators and witnesses of the special committee. I say the use of a congressional committee to give credence and publicity to such baseless charges has been unfair to these thousands of Americans and their organizations. Unfortunately, from the very outset this committee has been led astray and has given widespread publicity to charges made by men who have been later discharged by the



committee itself because it was learned that these persons were untrustworthy and undeserving of belief.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons unknown to me, the majority of the Rules Committee have seen fit to disregard the storm of protest raised against continuation of the committee and, ignoring the thousands of pleas for a sober, careful, and deliberate consideration of the resolution now before us, they have insisted upon a hasty and, to my mind, ill-considered report and vote by the House. Even my suggestion that the committee's membership be increased to avoid repetition of the charge of one-man dictatorship was rejected by the gentleman from Texas and a majority of the Rules Committee for reasons I cannot ascertain. I think increased membership would be a healthy thing for the committee and help accomplish all the work the chairman says is unfinished. Is it possible that increased membership might upset the program that the committee has already planned in advance of the action of the House in continuing it?

In all my congressional experience of 32 years, I know of no committee so broadly condemned because of its conduct by people in all stages of life and from all parts of the Nation. No one denies the necessity for a complete investigation into un-American activities as was contemplated when the Congress originally created this committee. But thousands of reliable and outstanding people insist that the committee has been solely a medium to smear political and civic leaders whose views, while being far from communistic, differ from those of the chairman of the committee. I recall a proposal often made by a gentleman in this House in the cloakroom that a demagogue club be formed in Congress and he be the president. I thought this was just humor, but I am seriously wondering now if it was not meant in dead earnest. Certainly thousands of law-abiding citizens and liberal-minded and progressive people who support the President, and even the President himself, have been exposed to the rankest kind of demagogery by the actions of this committee. And not only that, but in every section of the country Democratic candidates for high office have been falsely and maliciously accused of communistic alinements without a shred of evidence or justification for such baseless charges. Men made these charges while on the pay roll of a committee of Congress and who were later found to be labor spies connected with strikebreaking organizations and groups specializing in the lowest type of character assassination; men whose recklessness with the truth and general unreliability should have been ascertained by the special committee before they were permitted to fill hundreds of pages of the record with their outrageous charges and statements. This was bad enough, but when the special committee permitted itself to be used to allow veiled insinuations against the President to be made, their conduct not only disgusted but was resented by millions of fair-minded citizens of our country.

There is no need to explain why the Republicans favor continuation of the committee. I notice that they are unanimous in their support of this resolution and will undoubtedly vote for it to a man. I cannot wholly blame them for this strictly partisan attitude of utilizing the best opportunity they have had in years for what they hope will continue to cast discredit upon the Democratic Party, its officials, and a Democratic President. But I regret extremely that the Democrats are so short-sighted as to permit themselves to be used for such an unsavory purpose and to have Democratic legislators go to the extent of even refusing a fair chance and opportunity to Members of this House to express their views and submit evidence as to why this instrument of attack on organized labor and the Democratic Party should be stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, I originally supported and voted for the resolution that created this special committee in the belief that I was helping to bring about a real investigation of all the un-American and subversive activities in this country. I was therefore amazed to find out during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Rules that little or none of the original intent of the House had been carried out. Instead I became convinced that this committee had spent its time and

money on little less than a "smearing campaign" against all who have tried to promote liberal government and aid in supporting the great humanitarian principles of your President and mine. What about un-American organizations that spread bigotry, class prejudice, and racial hatred throughout this fair land of ours? Were they investigated by the committee? Was there any attempt made to find out who finances them and for what purpose? Was Mr. Pelley, of North Carolina, and his Silver Shirts, subpoenaed and investigated? Was the Republican candidate for Governor of Kansas, Mr. Winrod, investigated? Was Fritz Kuhn brought in and investigated? Were the Black Shirts of Michigan investigated? Oh, no; the committee could not get around to them before their money ran out, and I am wondering why.

It is a strange and distressing coincidence that the enemies of President Roosevelt and the administration will stop at nothing and use any kind of instrument at hand to undermine and try to destroy the confidence of our people in the administration. This is not the first time it has been tried, but it will fail like the others when the people realize who and what is back of these vicious smearing campaigns. How very much like the campaign against our American President now being carried in the Nazi press in Germany, how nearly in the same language are these vicious attacks by the agents of fascism, silver shirtism, nazi-ism, and other "isms" which are given credence and publicity by our ill-advised and misguided special committee. Only today newspapers report our President being called a "Bolshevist tool." Read the special committee's hearings and the press reports about them and see if that does not sound to you like the ravings now being carried in the Hitler press. The headlines in reactionary newspapers accompanying every hearing of this special committee have echoed in substance the vituperations of the German Nazis directed against our great President. I know the administration would not have uttered one word of criticism of the committee if it had felt its work and real purpose was to investigate and expose un-American activities, instead of attacking, libeling, and attempting to intimidate every liberal, progressive, and humanitarian group and person in sympathy with the objectives of our administration to better the conditions and lives of the masses of our people.

History repeats itself sometimes, and I know the future will justify my position and that of all others in this House who refuse to submit to partisan prejudice and political hysteria. No number of attacks on the President and his administration, no matter how cleverly masqueraded or concealed, will detract from his fine reputation and the noble and humane efforts he is making in behalf of our democratic form of government and especially in behalf of the needy and downtrodden for whose condition the greedy and avaricious special interests are responsible and whose agents howl gleefully at every attempt to smear him or those who support him.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that neither my conscience nor my sense of decency will permit me to vote for this resolution. I take the privilege under the leave granted me of inserting a few of the thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received in protest to continuing this special committee, at this point in the RECORD. These protests should satisfy any fair-minded Member that I am doing my duty in opposing the passage of this resolution. I hope, even in spite of my fears, that if the special committee is renewed, it will see a new light and sincerely try to do the job it was intended to do. But like the thousands who oppose its continuance, I go only by its past record, and I urge the Democrats of this House as good Democrats, to put an end to this partisan and political comedy by voting with me against the resolution.

The letters follow:

GRAND LODGE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,  
Cleveland, Ohio, January 9, 1939.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take this opportunity to call to your attention the fact that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is unalterably opposed to the granting of any additional money to the